DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 594 CS 005 582

AUTHOR Aulls, Mark W.
TITLE QASOR: A Framework for Interpreting Silent and Oral Reading.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 29p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (29th, San Antonio, TX, November 29-December 1, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education: *Error Analysis (Language): *Error Patterns: *Evaluation Methods: Informal Reading Inventories: Intermediate Grades: *Miscue Analysis: *Oral Reading: Reading Diagnosis: *Silent Reading

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the Qualitative Analysis of Silent and Oral Reading Instrument (QASOR), which was developed to provide an alternative to the Reading Miscue Inventory for observing the oral and silent reading of students in the middle and secondary grades. An overview of QASOR shows that it is designed for use by reading specialists and classroom teachers to estimate reading fluency, defined as the extent to which the readers engage in self-correction of major semantic cues, and the extent to which readers' miscues suggest their use of meaning across entire selections. Other sections of the description of QASOR discuss its seven major characteristics and their underlying rationale, how to select oral and silent reading materials for QASOR, methods of observation and coding, the interpretation of the inventory and its instructional implications, how to make meaning-acquisition interpretations, and why the comparison of oral and silent reading strategies is used. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189594

QASOR: A Framework for Interpreting Silent and Oral Reading

Mark W. Aulls

The Reading Miscue Inventory (1973, 1976) provides a thorough diagnostic procedure for investing how a reader integrates grapho-phonemic, syntactic and semantic information. The RMI represents a landmark among informal reading measures because the quantitative scores are organized within a specific theoretical framework for qualitative interpretations of what language cues the reader attends to and how well these cues are integrated while reading aloud.

However, the RMI does have certain shortcomings. Pikulski (1974) and Tortelli (1976) have suggested that many teachers do not have the time to carry out the extensive error (miscue) analysis procedures required by the RMI for even students reading well below grade level. In addition, the rationale and preparation of the silent reading component of the RMI does not enable comparibility and stability across multiple silent reading estimates. Furthermore,, only procedures for preparing estimates of silent reading of narrative material are fully explained. Finally, oral and silent reading scores do not appear to be comparible since oral reading estimates refer to enrouce processing while silent reading estimates refers to post processing information estimated by unaided recall. The

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mark W. Aulls

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CS205282

RMI test manual does not offer empirical reliability for how consistently the RMI scores reflect repeated samples of a student's oral or silent reading performance or how likely different examiners would be to obtain the same scores after analyzing the oral and silent reading of the same child. And the RMI manual does not offer empirical validity demonstrating that the oral and silent reading scores measure what they purport to measure. Unfortunately, there are no other published oral and silent reading inventories that offer empirical support for both the reliability or validity of their scores. The RMI, unlike other inventories does provide a clear and coherent framework for interpreting at least oral reading performance. And a number of unpublished studies are available to suggest that the RMI oral reading miscue estimates are sensitive to differences between the performance of able and less able readers at a variety of grade levels and to changes in oral reading performance across the elementary grade levels.

A coherent framework for the quantitative and qualitative analysis of a student's reading performance is essential if a teacher, and especially a reading specialist is to gain insights into what information in the text a reader attends to and which strategies he uses to integrate grapho-phonemic, syntactic and semantic information. This kind

of insight is necessary for deciding what grapho-phonemic information to teach and what strategies for integrating grapho phonemic, syntactic and semantic information to teach in order to improve a reader's ability to acquire information from narrative and expository materials used in classroom instruction.

Prior attempts to simplify the RMI, such as the one reported by Tortelli (1976), appear to error severely in the confidence one can place in inferences about a reader's performance. What appears to be desirable is an alternative to the RMI which: 1) reduces the number of oral reading miscues to be analyzed, 2) offers comparable estimates of miscues during oral and silent reading, 3) provides a replicable procedure for preparing silent reading estimates, 4) can be used to assess and compare the reading of both narrative and expository classroom materials and 5) provides greater sensitivity than the RMI to able and less able readers in the middle and secondary grades.

Overview of QASOR

The Qualitative Analysis of Silent and Oral Reading Instrument (QASOR) was developed by the authors to provide an alternative to the RMI for observing the oral and silent reading of students in the middle and secondary grades.

It is designed for use by a reading specialist but some classroom teachers may find the silent reading component useful for their own purposes. Ideally, the specialist and the classroom teacher would coordinate efforts to assess the oral and silent reading of children having severe reading problems. QASOR is based on similar psycholinguistic principles to the RMI but considers oral reading, in a testing situation, to bias some reader's to exagerate their reliance on foreward moving processing when, during silent reading, they may engage more frequently in rereading. Only by comparable ways of sampling oral and silent reading can consistencies or differences be detected. When inconsistencies are marked then only silent reading behaviors should be relied upon to generalize to how the reader performs during silent reading of classroom materials

QASOR is primarily intended to estimate reading fluency, the extent to which the reader engages in self correction of major semantic cues and the extent to which a readers' miscues suggest he is consistently making use of the meaning across an entire selection. Each of these estimates are independently acquired for narrative and expository material; and therefore, can be compared to determine whether he may need more help in reading exposition than narration. The estimates may be averaged over

narrative and expository passages to generalize to the reader's overall fluency, self correcting strategies and use of meaning cues. Finally, the authors provide a rationale for interpreting how level of reading fluency, type of self correction strategies and pattern of syntactic and semantic miscues may be related. Thus, unlike the RMI, the QASOR does not entail detailed recording and categorizine of grapho phoneme and syntactic miscues. Like the RMI self corrections are analyzed. Like the RMI miscues are analyzed to determine whether they make sense within the sentence they occur as well as within the total context of the selection up to the point at which each occurs.

There are seven major characteristics of QASOR which merit careful consideration. It:

1. includes a measure of oral and silent reading behavior
2. includes a measure of these behavior during the reading of both narrative and expository instructional material
3. includes a measure of oral reading fluency
4. focuses on meaning acquisition by examining the semantic acceptability of miscues
5. focuses on syntactic-semantic integration by examining the syntactic and semantic acceptability of self corrections.
6. examines qualitative differences in miscues across a total text by sampling oral and silent reading from the beginning, middle, and final portions of text.

7. uses a progressive cloze measure of silent reading literal comprehension which estimates both structure word and content word prediction and/or self corrections.

By focusing on semantic acceptability of self corrections and miscues, by including a measure of oral fluency, by examining oral and silent reading for both expository and narrative materials, and by examing the meaningfulness of miscues across the total text, QASOR provides considerable information regarding a reader's strategies for processing of meaning.

Rationale Underling The Seven Major Characteristics of QASOR Oral and Silent Reading

It is important not to overgeneralize oral reading performance to silent reading. By observing both, one can determine to what extent they are related in terms of the reader's use of strategies. The QASOR estimates oral reading performance through measures of fluency, semantic acceptability of miscues, and self correction silent reading is estimated by comparison between structure word and content word miscues and self corrections.

Expository Narrative Materials

Miscue research (Brazee, 1976, Carlson, 1970) has suggested qualitative differences in miscues between expository and narrative materials. Performance on one type

may not necessarily be generalizable to the other. The RMI is primarily concerned with sampling narrative material. QASOR is concerned with sampling both narration and exposition. QASOR should be especially useful to teachers concerned with how well a student can cope with exposition.

Oral Reading Fluency

Research and theory has suggested that students who cannot read consistently in phrases will have difficulty reading quickly, (Sleschinger, 1969) predicting outcomes, and (Glucksberg and Danks) constructing the writer's literal meaning. (Smith 1971, Mason & Kennedy 1978). Students who read word by word are especially limited in their ability to attend to the meaningfulness of printed materials. (Aulls 1978-9). By examining a reader's level of oral fluency, one can gain insights into how well a reader organizes and integrates syntactic and semantic information. It can be assumed that a reader is using grapho-phonemic information in co-ordination with syntactic information, if he reads beyond the word by word level. If it is difficult to be sure how well he uses syntactic and semantic information,. If reading is at the phrase level, the reader is utilizing the syntactic and semantic within each sentence, but how well he uses the semantic cues across the entire selection is not necessarily apparent. This requires additional

information. Students who do not read in phrases should be taught strategies for grouping words to enable them to distribute more attention to using context.

Meaning Acquisition

Meaning acquisition is assessed by the analysis of miscues during oral and silent reading. By examining a reader's miscues, it is possible to determine their semantic acceptability. That is, one can determine the extent to which a reader uses context. If a reader does, use context consistently, then he does direct more attention towares syntactic and semantic information than grapho-phonemic. If not, it will be necessary to teach strategies which will help the reader use context. There are at least two ways the reader can use context. Firstly, the reader can make miscues which make sense within a sentence up to the point of occurrence but do not represent what the writer intended the reader to understand. Secondly, the reader's miscues can make sense within the writer's total message, and therefore, represent what the writer intended.

Self Corrections

Self corrections during oral reading can also be used as an index of the reader's awareness of syntactic and semantic information. Good readers selectively self correct.

Poor readers either do not self correct or they over correct. The selective self corrector is aware of redundant information that links together a text message. He expects the general message of a passage to be consistent. When the general message is not consistent, within and/or between sentences or paragraphs, he self corrects. The poor reader who does not self correct is not aware of how meaning develops and pays less attention to the meaning intended by the writer than to the independent assignment of his own meaning to the text. The poor reader who overcorrects ignores meaning by focusing on the most immediate information being processed at the expense of integrating it with the larger meaning in the complete text message. By carefully examining the self corrections a reader makes and by relating these to his reading fluency level, one can determine to what extent a reader is integrating syntactic and semantic information systems. By relating self-corrections to a meaning acquisition score, one can determine how well the reader constructs and/or reconstructs meaning from the total text.

Selection of Materials for Oral and Silent Reading

The specialist or teacher using QASOR should select two narrative and two expository passages, approximately 1000 words each in length, from materials used regularly

in the classroom. One set of passages is used for oral reading, the other for silent reading. .Expository passages should be self contained and develop only one major topic. Each 1000 word selection should come from the same story or text book chapter.

It is important that passages be of adequate length since miscue research (Menosky, 1971) indicates that the quality of miscues changes when short passages are used for analysis. Goodman (1977) suggests that short passages do not provide the reader with sufficient cues to develop a sense of the author's meaning and style. "Longer texts offer redundant opportunities to recover and self-correct". (Goodman, 1977, p. 330). Smith (1971) suggests that longer passages are easier to read than shorter ones, as the greater the context, the greater the redundancy, and thus, the easier the prediction and acquisition of meaning. Equally important, the specialist and the teacher want to generalize to the typical, natural texts which the reader normally must use in the classroom. This can only be done when the text used for qualitative analysis reflects the length of assignments the teacher expects students to read independently. This length seldom falls below 1000 words. Finally, a text of 1000 words is necessary for an adequate number of cloze deletions through the progressive sampling technique to make stable inferences about the reader's

use of syntactic and semantic redundancy to predict words during silent reading.

Progressive Sampling of Oral and Silent Reading Miscues

In this inventory, miscues are analyzed only from the beginning, middle, and final sections of each 1000 word selection to determine whether or not the reader is benefiting from cumulative information acquired as he reads through a text. Thus to prepare narrative and expository selections, they should be divided into three sections which are equal in lingth. Each section is then subdivided into four equal parts. Oral and silent reading miscues are recorded only on the last quarter of each section.

Progression Cloze Measure of Silent Reading Comprehension

The standard n^{th} cloze deletion measure (usually every fifth or tenth word of a 300 word text) is a well known estimate of comprehension. However, Carroll (1971) has reported that this type of cloze measure is primarily an estimate of the reader's use of information within a three sentence, text boundary. Progressive cloze is similar to the standard n^{th} cloze in all respects but one. It deletes words only in the final quarter of the beginning,

middle and end section of a 1000 word text. The deletion of every fifth word in only the last quarter of each section allows estimates of the reader's use of the cumulative information in the unmulitated sections to comprehend the deleted portions of the text. Thus, it estimates the use of information beyond a three sentence boundary. A good reader who can take advantage of the unmutilated text's syntactic and semantic redundancy will be likely to make more errors in the earlier portions of the text, than in latter parts. The poor reader, who cannot take advantage of the cumulative text redundancy, should, when supplying deleted words, make an equal proportion of errors in the beginning, middle and final sections of text. The progressive cloze technique is an appropriate silent reading measure for QASOR because it is identical to the oral reading sampling procedures and allows inexact deletions to be analyzed like oral reading miscues. As well, it provides estimates through self corrections of both construction and reconstruction of text grammar and semantic structure during silent reading.

Observation and Coding

Coding Oral Reading Fluency

Listening to a tape recording of oral reading, one can assess a reader's level of oral fluency by assigning

values to each sentence read orally according to the following scale (Aulls, 1978):

A value of 1. is assigned when sentence is read word by word

A value of 2. is assigned when sentence is read predominately word by word with some two word groups

A value of 3. is assigned when sentence is read mostly in 2 and 3 word groups with some word by word reading.

A value of 4. is assigned when words in sentence are predominately grouped in phrases and some 2 and 3 word groups; 20% or more of the word recognition errors are syntactically unacceptable.

A value of 5. is assigned when words in sentences predominately grouped in phrases with less than 20% of the word recognition errors syntactically unacceptable.

A value of 6. is assigned when all words in sentence grouped in phrases; external punctuation of each sentence is consistently preserved.

A value of 7. is assigned when all words in sentence grouped in phrases; both external and internal punctuation is preserved.

It is not necessary to code all the sentences read aloud in the text. However, at least the sentences in the first and third sections should be coded.

One can obtain the fluency level for a text by dividing the total sum of the code values for each sentence by the number of sentences coded. The higher this score, the more fluent the reader and the greater the likelihood that he is able to integrate syntactic and semantic information.

Coding Meaning Acquisition

Each oral reading miscue (in the last quarter of each section) is

1) classified as a content or structure word
2) examined to see if it makes sense up to the point of error
3) calculated as % of sensible and nonsensible miscues for total miscues, structure word and content word miscues

The distinction between content and structure words distinguishes the reader who has basic problems with meaning acquisition because of semantic, as opposed to syntactic, processing problems. We recognize at least two levels of structure word function (within sentence and between sentence) and more than two levels of content word meanings. However, these distinctions are most useful only in highly refined analysis and will not be elaborated for a basic analysis using QASOR. By calculating the proportion of miscues that make sense it is possible to estimate the extent to which the reader is using semantic and syntactic cues.

In analyzing silent reading progressive cloze samples one should:

1) examine each word supplied by the reader (spelling does not count)
2) decide if the word supplied makes sense in the general context

3) calculate the % of total deletions, content word deletions and structure word deletions that were correctly supplied.

Adherence to meaning in both the general context and within the sentence being processed is necessary to describe meaning acquisition in oral and silent reading.

Self Corrections

Self corrections are different from uncorrected types of miscues. The reader may be successful or unsuccessful in attempts to self correct. Using QASOR, all self corrections should be noted, but only unsuccessful ones are analyzed. This analysis focuses on two aspects:

1) grammatical form class. - Is it different from the text word?

2) meaning change - Does the self correction fit the sentence context?

and If it does fit the sentence context, then does it radically change the meaning of the general context?

A good reader most often self corrects nouns, verbs, and pronouns since these words carry the most redundancy and general meaning in a text selection. General text meaning refers to the higher order topics and ideas of a text message structure. Adjectives, adverbs, and prepositions usually are not as critical to the general text meaning. Miscues on these types of words confound within sentence

meaning and to this extend confound the accumulati .g meaning the reader is acquiring. Often, changes in adjectives or adverbs can make sense within a single sentence and do not markedly change the overall meaning of a text. Changes in prepositions often do change within sentence meaning but often do not markedly interfere with the referential relationships between higher order topics and ideas. A reader can make a large number of miscues and still retain adequate comprehension of the general meaning as long as the miscues are in adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, and not in verbs, nouns, or pronouns.

Table 1 provides a composite summary of the materials procedure, oral reading analysis, fluency analysis and silent reading analysis.

Insert Table 1

Interpretation of Inventory and Instructional Implications

The relationship between levels of fluency and meaning acquisition.

Students in fluency levels 1 and 2 typically are unable to access sufficient syntactic and semantic information to read quickly or to maintain a higher percentage of meaningful than nonmeaningful miscues. They attend predominately to the grapho-phonemic, lexical, and orthogra-

Table 1

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF SILENT AND ORAL READING

Materials: Choose four 1000 word passages at or slightly above the grade level at which the student is reading. Two of the passages should be narrative; two should be expository.
Each passage should represent typical material required in the classroom. Each should be self-contained, and should develop only one major topic.

Procedure: One narrative and one expository should be selected for use in analyzing oral reading. The other narrative and expository are used for silent reading. Reader reads entire passage, but only selected portions(*) are analyzed. Divide each passage--silent and oral-- into three equal sections. Then divide each section into four equal parts, as follows:

ORAL MISCUES

Section 1

Tape record *

Section 2

Tape record *

Section 3

Tape record *

Fluency Analysis

Scale-Points

1-Word-by-word grouping
2-Mostly as 1, some 2 word groups
3-Mostly 2-3 word gps. some 1.
4-Word grouped predominantly in phrases--some 2-3 wd. gps. 20% or more WR miscues syntactically unacceptable
5-Same as 4. but less than 20% of WR miscues syntactically unacceptable.
6-All words grouped in phrases. External punctuation preserved consistently.
7-Same as 6, but external and internal punctuation preserved consistently.

SILENT MISCUES

Section 1

Cloze (5th) *

Section 2

Cloze (5th) *

Section 3

Cloze (5th) *

ORAL ANALYSIS

1. Determine oral fluency, using scale above. Divide total sum of point values by number of sentences coded.
2. Compare content vs.structure word miscues. Does production make sense to point of error? (See # 3 for SILENT ANALYSIS)
   Percent of all miscues that make sense gives estimate of reader's awareness of meaning as central to reading process
3. Determine whether reader over corrects(G-P), does not self-correct (Not meaningful), or selectively self-corrects (Only meaning interference). (See # 3 for SILENT ANALYSIS)
   Self correction most likely on N, V, P.

SILENT ANALYSIS

1. Determine whether word supplied makes sense.
2. Compare number of content vs. structure words supplied satisfactorily or miscued.
3. Difference between percent of content and structure word miscues suggests reader problem with semantic as opposed to syntactic processing.

phic information cues in the text. In short, their lack of accuracy and automaticity in decoding, as well as an absence of meaning centered reading strategies, reduces their potential to extract the full meaning available in a text. They need to be taught that their reading should sound like language. They need to learn strategies for guessing words or phrases they do not know. Many of these readers will need more word attack instruction. At the same time, they need opportunities to learn how to organize words into higher order groups through sufficient auditory and visual practice, with reading material at their independent level. (Aulls, 1978; Allington, 1978).

Readers in fluency levels 3 and 4 are beginning to group words into higher order units but cannot consistently and automatically read instructional level materials in phrases. These readers are more capable of distributing attention to syntactic and semantic information than readers at fluency level one and two. (Aulls, 1978; Smith, 1971). They will read faster with a higher percentage of meaningful than nonmeaningful miscues. However, their potential to predict within sentence information automatically and accurately is less well developed than that of students who read consistently in phrase groups. They will benefit from a similar type of instruction as students in fluency levels one and two. However, emphasis should be placed on

visual, rather than auditory, sentence segmentation exercises (Aulls, 1978). They should be taught that what they read must make sense as well as sound like language. This suggests that they need to learn to use both the context preceding and following a miscue to be abie to self correct successfully words or phrases which do not make sense within each sentence. (Hiddleman, 1978).

Readers in fluency levels 5, 6, 7, predominately read in phrases. With each succeeding fluency level they should demonstrate a higher proportion of accuracy in word or phrase prediction by preserving both external and internal sentence punctuation. These students read at a faster rate than those at the lower fluency levels. They have a higher potential for using between sentence referential information for weaving together the higher order meanings represented by superordinate (most general) and subordinate (specific) topics within narration and exposition. They should be able to recognize major characters, settings, major event, plot resolution, and themes of narration. (Thorndyke, 1977). They should have the highest percentage of meaningful miscues and a larger number or successful self corrections. However, this may not be true of all readers, as the ability to read consistently in phrases only opens up the opportunity to understand the higher level meanings intended by the writer. It does

not guarantee this achievement. (Aulls, 1978). They may need to learn rules for how to construct or reconstruct higher order topical referents in exposition or the relationship between episodades and the main goal of the protagonist in narrative stories.

The Relationship of self corrections to construction and reconstructing meanings during Oral and Silent Reading

There are three types of self correction patterns:
overcorrections
few or no self corrections
and selective self corrections

Each one merits careful discussion.

Overcorrection

In their attempts to construct meaning, readers who overcorrect base their corrections almost entirely on grapho-phonemic correspondences which most often are not successful because they cannot use syntactic-semantic information as an aid to correcting their grapho-phonemic miscues. They will not likely be above fluency level 4. Their self corrections are almost entirely restricted to information within the boundaries of single sentences. When these corrections are grammatically accurate, considering just the sentence in which the miscue occurs, the correction may not be sensible in the context of all preceding sentences up to the point of error.

Overcorrection is frequently concurrent with predom-

inately word by word reading and few if any strategies for using within and between sentence context cues to construct information. Overdependency on grapho-phonemic and orthographic information tends to lead to overcorrection at the expense of losing syntactic and semantic information.

Few or no self corrections

This parrern suggests that the reader does not perceive reading as involving both the construction and reconstruction of meaning. If fewer than half of the miscues are sensible, then the reader indicates awareness that reading should sound like language, but making sense is viewed as building in personal meaning at the expense of meanings intended by the author. The reader is constructing meaning as if sentences with miscues can be regarded as isolated statements or can be related purely on the basis of the idiosyncratic meaning assigned to pairs of sentences without regard to their relationship to preceding and following sentences. The reader who exhibits this pattern does not view reading as the reconstruction of meaning because reconstruction involves correcting important miscues on the basis of preceding or following information. This is especially true when the miscues entail nouns, verbs and pronouns that represent major topics, ideas or events. When major topics are misread, they

frequently change the specific relationship between the superordinate topics, main ideas or events and subordinate topics, minor ideas, or events. Sometimes these readers can remember a surprising amount from a passage read. However, they usually have difficulty organizing this information or drawing accurate inferences. Both these tasks require correct identification of referential relationships between superordinate and subordinate topics, ideas, and events. The reader who does not self correct typically falls between fluency levels 3 and 4. He often reads in phrases but may ignore the writer's original punctuation because she/he substitutes words or phrases to adjust the text meaning to his/her noun, verb, or pronoun miscues.

Selective self corrections

This reader corrects just those miscues which interfere with a sensible construction of incoming information on the basis of the total text message. This reader does not make the large number of self corrections that the over-corrector makes. He is selective. Only miscues which make major alterations in the writer's explanation of major topics or the referential relationships between subtopics or events are self corrected. Readers who selectively self correct demonstrate they are prepared to try to reconstruct

the writer's intended meaning in order to preserve at least the major meanings which underlie the total message. These readers usually are reading between fluency levels 4 and 7.

Meaning Acquisition Interpretations

The Relationship Between the Proportion of Meaningful and Nonmeaningful Miscues during Oral and Silent Reading

The reader whose meaningful miscues exceed his nonmeaningful miscues demonstrates that he knows reading should sound like language and make sense. Normally he will exhibit significantly fewer structure word miscues than content word miscues in both the oral and silent reading protocols. Fluency will usually be beyond fluency level 4. All self corrections will be sensible at either the sentence or total text level. In contrast, the reader with few meaningful miscues and many nonmeaningful miscues, will normally be at or below fluency level 4. He will either overcorrect or not self correct at al. The percentage of structure and content word miscues will be either quite high and quantitatively similar, or the highest percentage of miscues will be in structure words. If the latter case is true, the reader will usually be at or below fluency level 3. In the former case, the reader will be above level 3, but below level 5. While working on the

development of fluency, both types of readers need to be taught how to use context.

Comparison of Oral and Silent Reading Strategies

A comparison of meaningful oral reading miscues and silent reading cloze substitutions provides an opportunity to confirm whether the reader uses the similar reading strategies in both oral and silent reading. Silent reading substitutions and oral reading miscues are comparable because they are derived from the same segment of text with no intervention by the examiner. The reader with a fairlt high number of oral reading miscues may produce fewer miscues in silent reading. This occurs because oral reading emphasizes forward moving information processing, and does not offer the reader the same opportunity as silent reading to go back and recheck information.

Silent reading should always be used as the better estimate of how well a student can cope with getting information when reading independently. Even fluent readers who read a text aloud with few or no surface structure errors sometimes cannot remember enough information to answer inferential questions without the opportunity to reread the text silently. They can predict the phrase grouping and juncture of within sentence information by using the within sentence syntax, but they find it difficult to attend sufficiently to the referential relationships between the

major topics and/or events. During silent reading they are able to reread as necessary, and thereby to give more attention to semantic implications of the overall referential structure of the text. (Myers, 1978).

The relatively disfluent reader (fluency levels 1-30 who has many nonmeaningful miscues will usually exhibit similar oral and silent reading meaning acquisition scores. This happens because they have not learned strategies for attending to the syntactic and semantic information, but focus primarily on grapho-phonemic information. In contrast, the relativelt fluent reader may vary considerably in the proportion of meaningful miscues exhibited in oral reading when compared with silent reading. Frequently, these differences will reflect higher meaning acquisition scores in silent reading than oral reading. This pattern indicates that the reader is treating reading as both a construction and reconstruction process. The reader is able to compensate for within sentence prediction errors during silent reading by selectively reconstruction those miscues which are incongruent with the overall contextjal meaning.

For the disfluent reader, careful comparison between the proportion of structure and content word miscues in oral and silent reading should help a teacher decide whether a greater deficit exists in the use of structure or content words. If the structure word miscues primarily lack

contextual meaning, then instruction in the use of syntactic cues in combination with grapho-phonemic cues is sarranted. If only content word miscues predominately lack meaning, then instructional strategies for using referential relationships between topics, ideas, or events would be most beneficial.

In summary, the fluency, self-correction, and meaning acquisition scores should be interpreted in relation to one another, rather than independently. They should help a teacher estimate the extent to which a reader can integrate the use of grapho-phonemic, grammatical, and semantic information reading typical classroom material. The qualitative analysis of both oral and silent reading performance enables the teacher to have more than one window from which to view the reading process.

For specialists or teachers desiring more elaborate information on the use and interpretation of QASOR scores, please write the authors. At the present time, preliminary data is being gathered to evaluate the validity of the instruments qualitative scores and the reliability of the observations obtained by different examiners for the same child. Hopefully, with appropriate field testing and refinement QASOR will prove to be a worthy alternative to the RMI. Meanwhile, QASOR should serve to spark other reading professionals to consider the need for ways of measuring of reading within a coherent interpretative framework.

REFERENCES

Allington, R.L. "Sustained Approaches to Reading and Writing". Language Arts.Vol. 52, no. 6 (September 1975) 813-816.

Allington, R.L. Are good and poor readers taught differently, Is that why poor readers are poor readers? Unpublished paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, March 1978, 1-13.

Aulls, M. Developmental and Remedial Reading in the Middle Grades. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1978.

Brazee, P. "A qualitative and quantitative description of eighth grade students' oral reading in both narrativr and expository materials".Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1976.

Carlson, K.M. "A psycholinguistic description of selected fourth grade children reading a variety of contextual material". Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1970.

Carroll, J.B. Learning from Verbal Discourse in Educational Media: A Review of the Literature. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, October 1971, 1-293.

Goodman, K. & Goodman Y. "Learning about Psycholinguistic Processes by Analyzing Oral Reading". Harvard Education Review. Vol. 47, no. 3 (August 1977), 317-333.

Hiddleman, D. Developmental Reading: A Psycholinguistic Perspective. Chicago: Rand McNally Publishing Co., 1978.

Menosky, D.M. "A psycholinguistic analysis of oral reading miscues generated during the reading of varying portions of text by selected readers from grades 2, 4, 6, 8: a descriptive study". Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1971.

Meyers, B., Brandt, D. & Bluth, G.J. Use of Author's Textual Schema: Key for ninth grader's comprehension. Paper presented at the Am. Ed. Res. Assoc., Convention, Toronto. March 1978.

Pikulski, J. "A Critical Review: Informal Reading Inventories. The Reading Teacher, Vol. 28, no. 2 (November 1974) 141-151.

Smith, F. .Understanding Reading. New York, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1971.

REFERENCES

Thorndyke, P. "Cognitive Structures in Comprehension and Memory of Narrative Discourse". Cognitive Psychology, 1977, 9 (1), 77-110.

Tortelli, J.P. "Simplified Psycholinguistic Diagnosis". Reading Teacher, Vol. 29, no. 7 (April, 1976, 637-639).